



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/25/3374986

1 Ashcourt Drive, Hornsea, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU18 1EN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Lee Rider against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00748/PLF.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey extension to rear, construction of dormer to rear, increase in roof height, minor alterations to windows and doors and new render finish to external walls (Retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description given on the appeal form in the banner header above, as it is clear from the submissions before me that the description was amended during the planning application determination.
3. I was able to see at my site visit that the rear dormer, which has included an increase in the height of the roof, has been undertaken and thus those elements are retrospective proposals. One of the windows in the dormer constructed is notably larger than that shown on the plans provided and I note that an interested party disputes the amount by which the appellant says the ridge has been raised. However, neither of those issues have any material bearing on my consideration of the main issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Hornsea Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

Host dwelling

5. The East Riding Design Code Supplementary Planning Document 2025 (ERDC) is an adopted document which sets out design guidance and design codes. The document states that it has been created through consultation with the public and local stakeholders. Because of this and because it has only very recently been adopted, I afford it significant weight in terms of setting out the Council's design expectations for new development.

6. The ERDC states at G29 that dormers should not dominate a roof, with specific reference to such development being small in scale, aligning with existing windows and appearing as one with the existing building. The appeal dormer does not follow this guidance. What has been constructed is a large flat-roofed box dormer which takes up a significant proportion of the rear roof plane of the dwelling. This has taken place on a dwelling which would originally have been of a simple and unimposing design. As a result of these factors, it is a bulky addition which is not sympathetic to the design of the original dwellinghouse.
7. The appellant refers to the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Design Guidance for House Extensions 2007. The status of this document is not clear, but it is not identified in either the Council's delegated report or on the decision notice. In any event, even if it transpired that the 2007 document has not been formally revoked following the adoption of the ERDC, I would give precedence to the ERDC as the more recently adopted of the two documents.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the development has caused harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Consequently, it fails to accord with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Update 2025 (ERLPU), where it seeks to achieve a high quality of design. There is also a conflict with the aims of the ERDC in the same regard.

Conservation Area

9. The ERDC also identifies that areas which include heritage assets can be more sensitive to change and that a proposal needs to take the preservation and enhancement of the asset into consideration. There is a statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
10. The Conservation Area Appraisal 2006 (CAA) outlines that the special character of the Hornsea Conservation Area lies in its development as a small market town of diverse, mainly 19th Century architecture. This is what gives the CA its significance. As the appellant points out, it is not made expressly clear why the appeal property and several others along Ashcourt Drive have been included within the CA. The CAA sheds no light on this. These are all relatively modern bungalows, quite different in their design, appearance, age and visual impact to the older properties found along Eastgate which are more typical in terms of their age and architecture to other parts of the CA.
11. However, I observed at my site visit it is their relationship to those older properties which reveals the most likely rationale for their inclusion in the CA. The appreciation of the CA when walking along Eastgate includes views of the appeal property, and the dormer window which is subject to this appeal, across the existing properties, most notably Nos 23 and 25 Eastgate. In particular, notwithstanding its setback and orientation, in the view across No 23 it appears as an incongruous feature which jars against the impressive property at No 23, detracting from the character and appearance of the CA in clear contrast to the more modest roofscapes of the adjacent bungalows.
12. Whilst I appreciate that these views may be better screened at times when trees are in leaf, at the time of my visit there was a significant impact and one which has caused tangible harm to the character and appearance of the CA. This impact

would prevail through many months of the year. Furthermore, whilst accepting there is some statutory protection for trees in in a CA, reliance on trees on third party land to screen the development means a reliance that those trees would not be removed by others and/or that they would not die.

13. Dormers are not generally an established feature in the immediate locality however the appellant refers to what they consider to be a notable absence of rhythm due to the presence of mixed roof forms and differing alignment of properties. They consider that this provides the opportunity for alterations without causing harm to the character and distinctiveness of the local area. However, where this refers to the more modern dwellings, those roofscapes are unimposing and thus in clear contrast to the roofscape which has resulted from the appeal development.
14. Given the scale of the development and that its impact is limited to a relatively small part of the CA, I consider that less than substantial harm has been caused to the CA, to the lower end of that spectrum. Nonetheless, in light of the statutory duty that relates to this designated heritage asset, the harm caused carries considerable importance and weight in the planning balance of this appeal.
15. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant has not advanced any public benefits of the appeal development.
16. As such, the development does not comply with paragraph 215 of the Framework and is contrary to the requirements of the Framework in that regard. It also fails to accord with Policy ENV3 of the ERLPU where it seeks to conserve and enhance designated heritage assets, and which is also consistent with the requirement of the Framework in terms of demonstrating public benefits.

Other Matters

17. I acknowledge that the appellant states that the works are intended to improve their living conditions. However, this does not outweigh or justify the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR